G. R. S. 58

Previous references.

167

File No. ~~167~~ of 03 } 4

Serial Nos. 1–4 }

1904.

(hed)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 – 4

Part B. for Jan

SUBJECT.

False evidence alleged to be given by Mr G. S. David Asst. Surgeon

---

From the Senior Surgeon and Sanitary Commissioner No 7213 of 10-11-03.

Forwarding correspondence + expressing opinion re the decision against Asst Surgeon Mr G.S. David in a criminal case.

2. To the Registrar, Chief Court No. G. 2898 of 9-12-03.

Requests to be furnished with the records of the Criminal appeal no 8 of 03-04 on the file of the Chief Court.

3. From —do— no 3397/167 of 9-12-03.

Forwards the records called for.

GPB.–8,000—7-4-07

Fo No 5885
Q 23/06.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,
(REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS).

(Full Office Note.)

Subject.

Mr. G. S. David Assistant Surgeon, giving false evidence in a criminal Case of Forgery.

The Offg Senior Surgeon's letter No Q 213 of 10-11-03.

Note.

In the month of June, 1902, one Goorla Chikka Keggadi died at Mangalavaradpett in the Chennapatna Taluk, Bangalore District. Sometime after his death his brother, the 1st accused, got a will †registered in the Office of the Sub Registrar of Chennapatna, alleging that his brother, the deceased, had left it in his favour. The wife of the deceased, the Complainant and 1st witness for the prosecution, petitioned the Sub Registrar of Chennapatna on the 9th July, 1902, that rumours were afloat that her deceased husband's brother was trying to get a will registered by getting somebody to falsely personate her, and that, should such a document be presented

† 8th July 1902

‡ 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in black ink.

1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

do registration should not be effected. Having received a reply to her petition from the Sub Registrar that registration had been made in accordance with the rules, the widow of the deceased obtained a copy of the will, and knowing that her deceased husband had not executed any such document she filed a Criminal Complaint before the Sub-divisional Magte, Closepett, charging the accused with forgery. The Case was enquired into and Committed to the Sessions. The prosecution maintained that the deceased Chikka died on the 8th June/02, that he could not, therefore have executed the will on the 12th June, 1902, and that the will in question was a document forged by the accused persons.

The defence was to the effect that the deceased was living on the 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th June, 1902, that the 1st accused and others had taken him to the dispensary at Chennapatna on the evening of the 12th June for treatment as he was ill, that on the 13th June, 1902, the 1st accused took ~~from~~ for the patient medicine from the dispy

on

on a prescription given by the doctor Asst Surgeon Mr. G. S. David, that on the 14th June, 1902, the doctor visited the patient at his house in Mangalavarapett, and after examining the patient, pronounced his case to be hopeless. that Chikka, the patient, died on the 16th July, 1902, that he executed the bill in question 4 days previous to his death viz on the 12th June 1902 and that therefore the will was a genuine document executed by the deceased during his lifetime.

A number of witnesses and documents were examined on both sides. Assistant Surgeon Mr. G. S. David was the 6th witness examined for the defence and the register of out-patients of the Chennapatna Dispensary was also examined. At the end of para 18. of his judgment in the Case, the Sessions Judge, Mr. S. R. Subbaraya Iyer — states as follows.

The defence chiefly relies on the Hospital Register (Exhibit G) and the evidence of the Assistant Surgeon Mr. David, examined as the 6th witness for the defence but I regret to be obliged to characterise the

the evidence of the doctor as
discrepant and untrustworthy
and the Hospital Registers (Exhibit G)
as tampered with and unreliable

For the Judge's ~~his~~ observation
on the evidence of the Assistant
Surgeon referred to, please read
his judgment from the end of
page 17 to the end of ~~page 21~~ para 21.

The Sessions Judge found all
the 4 accused persons guilty of the
offences with which they were
charged. Viz, that they forged the
will and fabricated false evidence,
and sentenced them, the 1st accused
in whose favour the will had been
drawn, to rigorous imprisonment
for 3 years and a fine of Rs 100/, and
in default of payt, to add'l imprisonment
for another year, the 2nd & the 3rd
accused who had attested the
will, to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment
each, and the 4th accused, who
had written the will, to rigorous
imprisonment for 3 years.

With his dockets Nos $\frac{222}{85}$ and
$\frac{250}{79}$ of respectively the 18th and 29th
July 1903 the Sessions Judge forwarded
to the Offg Senior Surgeon Copies of
the judgment and the deposition of
Mr. David and extract from the
Hospital Registers for such notice
as

as he might deem fit to take, of the kind of evidence given by the Assistant Surgeon and of the Hospital Registers of Chemicalature being tampered with

The Offg Senior Surgeon forwarded the copies and extract received from the Sessions Judge to the Assistant Surgeon for remarks and early return

In the meanwhile the accused preferred an appeal to the Chief Court against the sentence passed on them by the Sessions Judge. The Chief Court confirmed the judgment of the Lower Court and dismissed the appeal. At the end of para 6 of their judgment, the Judges (Mr. Justice A. Ramachendra Ayyar, Chief Judge, and Mr. Justice A. Rangasamiengar, Judge) state

The deceased was admittedly subject to asthma yet the prescription shows that the medicine issued to him on 13th had no ~~sugar~~ ingredient calculated to check or relieve it. The internal evidence of the entry and the statements of the doctor and the other facts of the case throw grave suspicions on the truth of the evidence and of his conduct in the case and a reference will be made to the Senior Surgeon

in

in due Course

With his letter No 1975/241 of the 7th October, 1903, the Registrar of the Chief Court forwarded to the Senior Surgeon Copies of Judgments in the Chief Court and in the Session Court together with the Hospital Register and out-patient ticket for such action as he might deem fit to take against Apte Surgeon Daid of the Chennapatna Dispensary.

The Apte Surgeon whose explⁿ was called for by the Offg Senior Surgeon explains that the deceased was brought to the Dispy: on the evening of the 12th June, 1902, that he examined him then and found that his liver was enlarged, that he advised the men that had accompanied the patient, to leave him in the Dispy: as an in-patient, so that he might examine him more carefully, as he (deceased) was weak then; that as the men were wavering, he gave them time and went away on some urgent call, that by the time he returned in half an hour, the patient with his men had gone, that on the following day - 13th he sent medicine by the hands of the 1st accused who had come

for

for d. that on the 14th June 1902 he visited the patient, on a call, at his house at Mangalavarapett, that he then found the patient, on examination in a sinking state. that he entered the patient's name in the Dispy Register for out-patients, under date 13th June 1902, as present, because he had attended the Dispy the previous evening; that the prescription No 8202 was the one that he gave to the 1st accused the brother of the deceased. that he entered the mark of interrogation in the Register under the column disease, because he had not correctly diagnosed the disease with which the patient was suffering; that he cannot account for the erasure after the word Chikka in the Dispy Register, which was not in his custody all along, that he did not ask the Compounder of the Dispy to bring the prescription slip from the 1st accused; that he endorsed on the petition of the 1st accused after referring to the Register; that the petition of the 1st accused was read out to him by his Compounder Krishna Iyengar; that he was not therefore responsible for any inaccuracy

inaccuracy in that petition which ~~that~~ was in Kanarese, that the ticket 8202 was also presented to him with the petition; that he is not able to state how Chikka Nimma, one of the witnesses for the prosecution got possession of it that he cannot say whether the compounder who asked the 1st accused to give him the ticket was playing in the hands of the prosecution, and that he deposed in the Sessions Court that he visited the patient on the 13th, in a hurry and in excitement and confusion brought on in the witness-box under a severe Cross-ex^{n}, &c.

In forwarding the above explanation with his present letter, the Offg Civil Surgeon Senior Surgeon states that it is satisfactory to him. ~~He says~~ ~~he does~~ In paras 4 & 7 of his letter he has made certain observations on that a portion of the judgment of the Chief Court directly concerning the Apth Surgeon. In para 4, he states that the Apth Surgeon has satisfactorily explained in his letter the different

statements

statements he made as regards the visit of the deceased to the dispensary

In para 5 he states with refce to the alteration and erasion in the Disply Registers after the name of the deceased that the proper way to examine the erasion is by means of transmitted light and that it can thus be seen that nearly all the erasion has been clumsily done <u>below</u> the blue line. He says he examined the numerous other Chikkas in the registers and that in not a single one of them is any part of the word or words below the blue line. He invites attention particularly to patient No 7360 - Chikkathimma, and he says he would be glad to find a forger who could erase the word "thimma" leaving an erasion mark such as that under discussion. It would be impossible, he states, and this erasion is therefore nothing but a clumsy forgery - if the term is applicable to such procedure

In para 6 he states with refce to the 1st accused giving the out-patient ticket to the Compounder "To me there is nothing extraordinary about it, seeing the

Compounder

Compounder told the accused that the doctor wanted it. What does seem to me very extraordinary is that the Sessions Judge did not order the Compounder to appear for examination. The Judge says that the fact that the Compounder was not examined tells against the accused. Surely it was the Judge's business, if he was really anxious to get the whole facts, to cause the Compounder to appear before him and examine him.

Note - In this departmental enquiry, the Offg Senior Surgeon has not examined the Compounder and no notice of him is taken.

In para 7 with refce to the judgment which says that "the deceased was admittedly subject to asthma, he says that he examined into this matter carefully and that there is not a particle of evidence to show that the deceased had then or ever had asthma. He is of opinion that the deceased had only been loaded with the leakages from a hampered circulation and that he could hardly breathe, but that there was in no sense asthma. So, he states, "it is a bit amusing to read

read the learned Judges further remark "yet the prescription shews that the medicine issued to him on the 13th had no ingredient calculated to check or relieve it" The fact is however that the prescription given by the Assistant Surgeon contained drugs recognised as very useful in this so called "asthma".

In Conclusion, the Offg Senior Surgeon states that the light he has thrown on this portion of the evidence – a matter of pure pathology – will enable Govt to estimate at its true value the concluding sentence in para 6 of the judgment under discussion.

Submitted for orders

AGC 10/11/03

The Offg Senior Surgeons remarks that nearly all the erasion has been chemically done below the blue line does not seem to be correct as he seems to have examined it by the three lights at right angles & not the correct side

I cannot understand this?

When on the 13th morning, the patient & his brother took the medicine for him he did not appear in person,

Assistant Surgeon had to no business to mark P. against his name. This itself shews that the Register was not correctly maintained by the Asst. Surgeon

The asstt Surgeon admits that the Register has been tampered with but that it was not in his custody all along. His argument cannot be admitted as it is only the Medical Officer in charge of the Dispensary that keeps the Register with him & issues prescriptions. Besides, he was in charge of the Dispensary from June 1902 to ~~January~~ October 1902 during which the case was brought against the accused.

If as the Assistant Surgeon says that the 1st accused gave a petition asking him to give a certificate mentioning the date of admission of the deceased & the disease for which he was treated & there was nothing to prevent him

from declining to comply with
the Petitioners request as there
was a erasure in the Register
against the name and the disease
had not been diagnosed and in
fact, the assistant Surgeon was
not sure whether the patient
attended the Hospital on the 12th
or 13th.

The erasure, the
issue of the Certificate and the
subsequent Conduct of the Asstt.
Surgeon in giving different dates
on which he saw the patient
before the Committing Magistrate
& the Sessions Judge, so to show
that the Asstt. Surgeon is not
free from the blame attached to him

Filed for orders

28/11/03

The erasure is as the Senior Surgeon says below the blue line. The word shd have been written in two lines if this is to ~~be~~ be taken as a genuine erasure. There is no other name which the Surgeon has so written & the word is short enough for one line.

Barring this, there seems to be no point against the Dft Asst Surgeon which is strong enough to justify a charge of perjury. There is something suspicious no doubt but it is not likely to be taken as sufficient evidence of guilt.

If any notice is to be taken, I think the fairest way is to allow his regular prosecutor though I think that the case is not strong enough for it

Orders solicited

[signature]

30/11/13

yrs

[illegible] Examination [illegible] that there was any writing & that it was erased ~~in the Certificate~~ Erasure [illegible] is [illegible] has it been the place of any thing that had been written?

12th or 13th - how very important

Production of Certificate by Chukka Thimma [illegible] Name [illegible] the Examination of the Darsi Examination Medicine prescribed - [illegible] by Surgeon [illegible] Examination

The Dewan through the 2nd Councillor

Erasure - was there any writing at all

How about the erasure under the blue line?

"Dyspepsia" is not in the apothecary's handwriting

Mr Dowd had not the exclusive custody of the Register

Date - 13th or 14th - The apothecary's explanation cannot be rejected

P - That the man abscanded before the apothecary on the evening of the 12th seems to be a fortuitous circumstance for the safety of the 13

Ticket - Production by Chemist seems inapplicable How did the prisoner get at him under?

Prescription - There is much in what Mr Dowd says

Mr Davis conduct - negligent
and perhaps not adequate
fall from ladder

C

4/12/03

The several suspicious circumstances noticed by the Sessions Judge and the Chief Court have been fairly satisfactorily explained by the Assistant Surgeon both whom the Senior Surgeon concurs. This is a delicate matter - No further departmental action seems called for. The correspondence may either be filed or recorded

A/Secretary to Govt
4/12/03

To the Dewan.

14518
5.12.03.

4/12/03

Submitted with the records received from the Chief Court.

5/12/03

5.XII.03

5/12/03

Submitted with the records received from the Chief Court.

14/12/03

14/12/03 15/12

14709
16.12.03 The Dewan

It is unfortunate that Mr David has rendered himself liable to be commented upon by the Civil Court as his evidence has been characterised as unworthy and false and it is impossible that Govt can have given credit to the statement of the Civil Surgeon - Further is not expedient to take any judicial action, but Mr David must be warned to be very careful in future. ^ He should for some time at least be placed under the control of an independent Civil Surgeon who is required to send a report of his conduct after six months

The Senior Surgeon has given a very good account of this work in reasons stated by the Civil Surgeon and this Govt are prepared to keep him under observation

18.XII.03

To H Stonier

19/12/3

I defer to the Dewan's opinion. The order may be issued accordingly. This is regrettable but there seems no help for it. Mr David has for sometime past been in

in ~~the~~ medical charge
of the Chitaldrug District
He seems to be doing
very well there and
the DDS Senior Surgeon
who was at Chitaldrug
a few weeks ago
spoke to me in
appreciative terms
of his work. That-
being so it is really
necessary to remove
Mr David from inde-
-dent. charge If
the Dewan on further
consideration thinks
this I am quite willing
to abide by his decision

22/12/03

To the Dewan

23/12/3

14894
24.12.03.

06295

Necessary orders
approved & hand copies
shown kept in charging
Mr Rao as allowance
may be waived

31.XII.03

D.a.

3/1/4

E. 1544

19

81(1)

FROM

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No. 1 file of
Residency Surgeon

Forwarding correspondence and expressing opinion re the decision against Asst. Surgeon Mr. G. S. Govind in a criminal case

C/
12.11.03

Rec'd
11.

No. 227/85 of 25.7.03 from Assistant Surgeon, Kolar Gold Fields, Bangalore forwarding his explanation

This office memo No. 2356/3.9.03 to A.S. Mr. G.S. Govind

Enclosure memo. 203/25.8.03 from A.S. Govind, Kolar Gold Fields Surgeon

203/25.8.03 — do — submitting his explanation

2550/79 & 227/30.7.03 from the Assistant Surgeon, Kolar Gold Fields Surgeon with 3 enclosures viz.

Explanation of A.S. Govind before Thali court

Translation of his explanation before the Assistant Commissioner for Kolar Taluk in Kannada

Extract from the Kolar Taluk Register showing result of Senior Surgeon's case, I / Register

1975/1241 dated 17.10.03 from the Registrar showing judgment-Mr. Govind's case, Subsidiary I to IV

Copy of Assistant Surgeon's judgment, copy of charge framed by Asst. Commissioner, Kolar, dated 21st July '03

I call Assistant-Register with charge framed by Asst. Commissioner, Kolar, dated 21st July '03

From

Lt. Col. John Smyth M.D, I.M.S,

Offg: Senior Surgeon & Sanitary Commissioner

with the Government of Mysore, Bangalore

To

H. V. Nanjundayya Esq. M.A, M.L,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore

General and Revenue Departments, Bangalore

Dated 18 November 1903

No G 213

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for the information of the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, certain papers (noted in the margin) wherein Assistant Surgeon Mr. David of Chitaldroog is practically accused of perjury and forgery by the Chief Court of Mysore.

2. Among the papers is Mr.David's explanation which is to me satisfactory.

3. I shall only add a few sentence dealing with the judgment of the Chief Court which Mr. David had not seen when he wrote his explanation. The paras in the judgment, I have marked in blue pencil for convenience of reference and I shall deal only with that para that immediately concerns the Assistant Surgeon- it is para 6.

4. The first point sought to be made against the Assistant Surgeon is that his evidence is untrustworthy, because on one occasion he said , the deceased visited the dispensary on the 13th June and on another he said the visit was paid on the 12th

12th I consider the Assistant Surgeon has satisfactoril explained this in his letter to me.

The second point said to be against him is that, his Register shows that the entry of the name said to be that of the deceased bears marks of alteration and erasion. The deceased name was Chikka and the Court was of opinion or rather accepted the statement of the prosecution, that the name had originally been Chikka Thimma,. well, there certainly is an erasion, but to me nothing can be clearer than that, the original entry was not Chikka Thimma. The proper way to examine the erasion is by means of transmitted light & it can thus be seen that nearly all the prasion has been clumsily done below the blue line. Now I have been to the trouble of looking up the numerous other Chikkas in the register and in not a single one of them is any part of the word or words below the blue line. I invite attention particularly to patient No. 7360- Chikkathimma, and I should be glad to find a forger who could erase the word " thimma " leaving an erasion mark such as that under discussion. It would be impossible and this erasion is therefore nothing but a clumsy forgery- if the term is applicable to such procedure

No - 5th is above or incorrect line JB 27/11

6. At the bottom of the same page of the judgment and in the same para as the above is a surmise as to why the 1st accused gave the out patient ticket to the compounder seeing it was so important a document. To me there is nothing very extraordinary about it seeing the compounder told the accused that

12th . I consider the Assistant Surgeon has satisfactorily explained this in his letter to me.

The second point said to be against him is that, his Register shows that the entry of the name said to be that of the deceased bears marks of alteration and erasion. The deceased name was Chikka and the Court was of opinion or rather accepted the statement of the prosecution, that the name had originally been Chikka Thimma,. well, there certainly is an erasion, but to me nothing can be clearer than that, the original entry was not Chikka Thimma. The proper way to examine the erasion is by means of transmitted light & it can thus be seen that nearly all the erasion has been clumsily done below the blue line. Now I have been to the trouble of looking up the numerous other Chikkas in the register and in not a single one of them is any part of the word or words below the blue line. I invite attention particularly to patient No. 7360- Chikkathimma, and I should be glad to find a forger who could erase the word " thimma " leaving an erasion mark such as that under discussion. It would be impossible and this erasion is therefore nothing but a clumsy forgery- if the term is applicable to such procedure

No - 2h is above on the Correct line
27/11

6. At the bottom of the same page of the judgment and in the same para as the above is a surmise as to why the 1st accused gave the out patient ticket to the compounder, seeing it was so important a document. To me there is nothing very extraordinary about it seeing the compounder told the accused that th

the doctor wanted it. What does seem to me very extraordinary is that the Sessions Judge did not order the compounder to appear for examination. The Judge says that the fact that the compounder was not examined goes against the accused. Surely it was the Judges business, if he was really anxious to get the whole facts, to cause the compounder to appear before him and examine him.

Furtheron the judgment says " the deceased was admitted subject to asthma " But I have examined into this carefully and there is not a particle of evidence to show that the deceased had then or ever had asthma. The deceased had lungs loaded with the leakages from a hampered circulation and he could hardly breathe but that is in no sense asthma. So it is a bit amusing to read the learned Judges further remark " yet the prescription shows that the medicine issued to him on the 13th had no ingredient calculated to check or relieve it " The fact is however, that the prescription given by the Assistant Surgeon contained drugs recognised as very useful in this so called " asthma

8. I trust that the light I have now thrown on this part of the evidence- a matter of pure pathology- will enable Government to estimate at its true value the concluding sentence in paragraph under discussion.

I have the honor to be
.-Sir,
Your most obedient, servant

Lt.Col.I
Offg: Senior Surgeon & Sany: Comm'r: M

the doctor wanted it. What does seem to me very extraordinary is that the Sessions Judge did not order the compounder to appear for examination. The Judge says that the fact that the compounder was not examined goes against the accused. Surely it was the Judges business, if he was really anxious to get the whole facts, to cause the compounder to appear before him and examine him.

7. Furtheron the judgment says " the deceased was admittedly subject to asthma " But I have examined into this carefully and there is not a particle of evidence to show that the deceased had then or ever had asthma. The deceased had lungs loaded with the leakages from a hampered circulation and he could hardly breathe but that is in no sense asthma. So it is a bit amusing to read the learned Judges further remark " yet the prescription shows that the medicine issued to him on the 13th had no ingredient calculated to check or relieve it " The fact is however, that the prescription given by the Assistant Surgeon contained drugs recognised as very useful in this so called " asthma "

8. I trust that the light I have now thrown on this part of the evidence- a matter of pure pathology- will enable Government to estimate at its true value the concluding sentence in paragraph under discussion.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

M.D.
Lt.Col.I.M.S.
Offg: Senior Surgeon & Sany: CommR; M. G.

81 (2)

Office Draft. (Letter.)

Urgent

Mysore Government,
General & Revenue Secretariat.

To

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore

Date of passing the draft
Date of despatch 9/12/03

Regd. No. G 2818 81
File No. & date (if any)

No. of Encls.

Sir,

I am directed to request the favour of your forwarding to this Office the entire records in Criminal Appeal No 8 of 1903-4 on the file of the Chief Court of Mysore.

I have &c

9/12/03
for Secy
8/12/03

(General Serial No. 30.)

G 1933
12-12-

~~189~~ 1903-04

81. (3)

From The Registrar of the Chief Court, Mysore

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore

Dated 9th Dec. 1903

Despatched 11"

Received

Enclosures No. Record

General No. 3397

No. 167

Forwards records pr Plummer appeal No. 8 of 1903-04 on the file of this Court and Bangalore case No. 13 of 1902-03 on the file of the Sessions Judge Bangalore Division

G.

~~2nd~~

11/12/03 Why

No. 3397 / 167 Judicial

Bangalore 9th December 1903.

From,

V. A. Rajaratna Mudaliar Esq.
Registrar Chief Court of Mysore.

To,

H. V. Nanjundayya Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: G 2898 dated 9th Instant, I have the honor to forward the entire records in the Criminal appeal No: 8 of 1903-4 on the file of this Court and Bangalore Sessions Case No: 13 of 1902-3 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Bangalore Division -

The out-patients' Register of Chennabatna Hospital and Exhibit No: 2 in the above sessions case have been forwarded to the Senior Surgeon, Mysore Government with this Office No: 1975/1241 dated 7th September 1903.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Registrar.

Nilu

1904 81. (4)

Read Letter No 9213 dated the 10th November, 1903, from the Offg Senior Surgeon and Sanitary Commr with the Govt of Mysore, forwarding (1) Copies of Judgments in Criminal Appeal No 8 of 1903-04 on the file of the Chief Court of Mysore, and in Bangalore Sessions Case No 13 of 1902-03 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Bangalore Dist, and (2) the explanation obtained from Mr G. S. David, Assistant Surgeon, and reporting upon the evidence of Mr G. S David who was exd as a witness for the defence in the said Criminal Case.

Read also — the Criminal Records of the Case received from the Regr of the Chief Court with his letter No 33 of the 9th Dec 1903.

22/1/04

Order thereon. No. G 3523/4 of 16/11/04

In July, 1903, one Doddiah and 3 others of Mangalavarapet in the Cheinapatna Taluk were convicted by the Sessions Judge of the Bangalore Dn of forgery of a will and of fabricating false evidence, and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment and fine. The accused thereafter preferred an appeal agst the sentence to the Chief Court of Mysore, where the findings of the Sessions Judge were affirmed and the appeal was dismissed

Mr G S. Dowell, Advocate General who was at the time the Crown Prosecutor in the case ~~Crossed~~ stated that the will was forged

~~He~~ in charge of the Local Fund Dispensary at Chennapatna was ~~examined~~ one of the witnesses examined for the defence in the Case referred to Both the Sessions Judge and the Judges of the Chief Court have characterised the evidence of the Assistant Surgeon in the Case as untrustworthy and false and ~~the Chief Court~~ the Offg Senior Surgeon ~~has been~~ requested to take for such notice of the Conduct of the Medical Officer as he deems proper.

and a Copy of the remarks was sent to

3. The Offg Senior Surgeon ~~has reported~~

Reports that the explan offered by the Asst. Surgeon is satisfactory. Govt observe that it is unfortunate that Mr David has rendered himself liable to be severely commented upon by the Chief Court severely. His evidence has been characterized as untrustworthy and false and it is impossible that Govt can overlook this opinion of the Chief Court and of the Sessions Judge. For the reasons given by the Senior Surgeon however, it does not seem expedient to take any judicial action in the matter, but Mr David must

The Senior Surgeon has reported the matter to Govt, with his opinion that the Asst. Surgeon gave a satisfactory explanation, and that there was no reason to suspect that he had perjured himself as found by the Judges

4. Govt however cannot fully endorse the opinion of the Senior Surgeon. It

must be warned to be
very Careful in future.
The ~~Offg~~ Senior Surgeon
has stated that
has ~~given a very good~~
he has done good
~~account of his~~ work
in the Chittaldrug Distt.
and the Govt. are
therefore pleased to keep
him ~~in Medical charge of the Distt~~
allow his being Continued there; him there, but he
must be watched
by the Senior Surgeon
who is requested to
send a report of
his Conduct after
six months.

Devaus
order

Hm
6/1/4
Secy

HD
5/1/04

HM
5/1/04

To The Offg Senior Surgeon
Retg the enclosures
Registrar of the Chief
Court of Mysore with
the records ~~sent~~ from
him.